DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 326 050 FL 018 968

AUTHOR Best, Linda
TITLE Freire's Liberatory Learning: A New Pedagogy Reflecting Traditional Beliefs.
PUB DATE 90
NOTE 30p.
PUB TYPE Viewpoints (120)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Business Administration Education; Case Studies; Comparative Analysis; *Educational Philosophy; *Educational Strategies; *Educational Theories; Elementary Secondary Education; English (Second Language); Higher Education; Second Language Instruction; Second Language Learning; Teaching Methods
IDENTIFIERS Deweys Experimentalism; *Freire (Paulo); Harvard University MA; *Liberatory Learning; Socratic Method

ABSTRACT

A discussion of Paulo Freire's contemporary pedagogy looks at the philosophy underlying the approach in the context of traditional educational philosophy. Freire's pedagogy of the oppressed, Liberatory Learning, which was originally developed as a reponse to illiteracy among Brazilian peasants, also holds significance for other culture and contexts as a model of learning for developing literacy and enabling individuals to understand, respond to, and to some degree control the circumstances and directions of their lives. The history of the approach's development is chronicled and the method examined in writing and English-as-a-Second-Language programs in U.S. universities. It is then proposed that Liberatory Learning is a re-working of fundamental principles regarding learning for Freire's specific goals, using methods usually reserved for literate, responsible learners such as Greek scholars and graduate-level business students: dialogue, student engagement, and reflection and response. It is argued that the responsibility and action Freire hopes to inspire among the illiterate, through literacy and authority, parallel the learning processes characterizing the Socratic method, Dewey's experimentalism, and the Harvard Business School case method. Illustrations and further comparisons are offered. A brief bibliography is included. (MSE)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED326050

FREIRE'S LIBERATORY LEARNING: A NEW PEDAGOGY REFLECTING TRADITIONAL BELIEFS

LINDA BEST
STATE UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK AT GENESEO

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

L. Best

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

FL018568

INTRODUCTION

Contemporary educational practice regarding composition and English as a Second Language instruction in American colleges advocates student-centered learning for the development of language skills. Fundamental to this practice is the understanding of literacy articulated in the pedagogy of Paulo Freire -- its enabling power, achieved through focus on relevant human experience, which permits individuals to understand the world around them and thus envision their role in it.[1] Borrowing from this view of language as a mediator of social awareness, writing and ESL instructors replicate many of Freire's principles in their teaching; creating a student-centered environment and engaging students in learning through dialogue and collaboration, teachers hope to empower them with responsibility and authority so that they might achieve a sense of control over their studies and their prospective goals.[2]

Thus, the pedagogy Freire developed as a response to illiteracy among Brazilian peasants holds significance for other cultures and contexts. In fact, his insights not only direct contemporary methods for achieving literacy, but they likewise reiterate traditional views regarding education voiced in the classical models and practiced in very different settings. Freire's new pedagogy, then, serves as

a vehicle for the emergence of beliefs regarding the learning process which have endured through time -- the importance of dialogue in the educational process, the need to engage students actively in their learning, and emphasis on learning which inspires activity and response.

AN OVERVIEW OF FREIRE'S PEDAGOGY: ITS SOURCE AND BASIC PREMISES

Having received the UNESCO Prize for Education in 1986, Freire has earned international recognition for his contributions to education. Initially, his pedagogy responded to conditions he discovered in his homeland, Brazil, after he and his family lost their middle class standing in the economic turmoil of the late 1920s. During this time, Freire discovered the oppressed, the "culture of silence," who, as illiterates, possessed no voice, no critical awareness of their living conditions, nor any understanding of how they might control, to some degree, the direction of their lives.[3] Freire realized that political forces, the ideology of elite, dominant classes, controlled the educational and social practices of lower classes, conditioning them to think that the direction of their lives could never change.

In schools, no suitable programs for lower socio-economic groups existed. The distance, exemplified by economic standing, which separated teachers from students reinforced students' alienation in the classroom. Rather

than recognizing the individual needs of impoverished students, teachers blamed their learners for the elite/illiterate clash and responded with a mission dedicated to imposing mechanistic, authoritarian thought on students in order to "teach" them.[4] Economic differences surfacing in the classroom, then, succeeded in strengthening the authority of the oppressors while destroying or inhibiting the creativity and thought of the oppressed; individuals from the lower classes were not being taught to understand and respond to the circumstances of their lives but conditioned to endure their indignity through ignorance. The inequity Freire discovered reflected social problems in his homeland rooted in class distinctions. Existing on different planes, students and teachers were incapable of communicating or discouraged from doing so by unwritten social codes governing behavior.

Tremendous conflict existed between the conditions Freire witnessed and the type of education he envisioned as critical to his students' emancipation -- relevant, student-centered, experiential learning rooted in social contexts. Freire, having enjoyed the benefits of schooling, realized others were confined to hopeless poverty by an educational system and society ignoring their identity and denying them the type of learning -- liberatory learning -- which could elevate their awareness and, quite possibly, promise their escape from oppressive conditions: "We are not talking about instruction in a school that simply

prepares learners for another school, but about a real education where the content is in a constant dialectical relationship with the needs of the country."[5] Educational processes had to attend to students' very different life experiences for learning to emerge.

Freire's pedagogy of the oppressed, Liberatory Learning, is a model of learning for developing literacy and subsequently enabling individuals to understand and respond to their living conditions. With appropriate methods, Freire believes, emerge language skills, simultaneous reflection of real-life problems, and, eventually, emancipation -- liberating learning, the ability for individuals to "name" [know] their world. Freire discovered that students learn to read and write when they simultaneously learn the personal and social significance of these skills.[6] "Conscientization," the learning process he envisions, is characterized by deepening human awareness "both of the socio-cultural reality that shapes . . . lives and [the] capacity to transform that reality. It involves praxis . . . the dialectic relationship of action and reflection."[7] Critical to "conscientization" is dialogue, for "Every human being, no matter how 'ignorant' or submerged in the 'culture of silence' he may be, is capable of looking critically at <u>his world</u> in a dialogical encounter with others."[8] With dialogue, Freire's principal method, follow other techniques for ensuring certain requisites for

learning Freire stresses -- student engagement and reflective activity.

Advocating dialogue as a tool critical to learning, Freire is not committed to its use simply because his students lack any other medium. Engaging advanced literacy students in dialogue as well, he values it as the means for revealing what students know and for controlling the inhibiting knowledge of their teachers. Through dialogue, students' knowledge is not only exposed, but challenged and re-discovered as well; individuals engaged in learning through dialogue are subjects of the educational process, a requisite for Freire, who opposes passive, silencing methods of learning.[9] Challenging the banking model of education whereby knowledge is deposited or "poured" into students, he practices its antithesis, dialogue, for the "word cannot be deposited; [it] must be borne of the creative effort of learners."[10]

Freire's students, oppressed by dominant political forces controlling their educational, economic, and social conditions, demonstrate well the power of dialogue; their participation, their response to authority, generates the type of tension which carries the acquisition of language skills to critical reflection and discovery so that language can, indeed, enable social change.[11] Dialogue, Freire believes, permits both teachers and students to mobilize, and in this way they anticipate a new reality through sharing and thus knowing each other's experiences.[12]

Guided by facilitators rather than authoritarian figures, dialogue ensures the student engagement and active learning Freire demands in his pedagogy. Describing his projects as programs which can transform naivete to a critical attitude and simultaneously teach reading, Freire urges educators to understand that educational pursuits, particularly the development of skills, must engage individuals as subjects of the learning process rather than passive recipients, empty vessels, receiving knowledge. Only then can language emerge and extend beyond the printed word to broad social concerns as well as critical thought. Envisioning active learners engaged in ongoing reflection of subject-matter -- real-life problems -- in a state of flux, Freire describes both literacy and learning, then, as the creation and re-creation of identity and context.[13] Thus, his teaching stimulates awareness of the power of literacy, how it influences citizens to voice concerns and implement changes which will benefit their lives. Again, Freire's students do not absorb knowledge professed by a teacher; learning in this manner represents the authoritarian domestication he resists. Rather, engaged in learning as subjects, they act and reflect. Understood as growing awareness and individual response rather than knowledge transferred from a teacher, what students take with them from the learning process has a direct impact on their lives. It inspires them to reflect, to act -- to transform their living conditions.

Critical to Freire's pedagogy and its focus on literacy and social response is the fusion of appropriate methods and subject-matter/materials. Referring to his successful programs, Freire describes curriculum shaped through, with, and/or by his students: the generative words which emerged from their contexts, words describing problems associated with their living conditions, and which provided exemplars of their language's phonemic system and likewise permitted discussion and reflection achieved through tension within the group; the codification and decodification of visual representations through which his students discovered and discussed universal themes. Freire prepared carefully for the study groups he organized, understanding subtle regional differences among his countrymen and thus anticipating curriculum reflecting their unique identities and living conditions.[14]

Knowing that students' verbal communicative skills grounded in experience promise the emergence of comparable reading and writing skills, Freire stresses, then, the socio-political significance of <u>relevant subject matter and authentic materials to which students can respond critically</u>:

> If nonreaders learn to read by writing and reading their own words and opinions, then they learn that their perceptions of reality are valid to others and can influence even those in authority. If, on the other hand, their teachers require them to learn the words and ideas in a primer that is donated by those in power, then the learners must accept that experience

> as more valid than their own. They must accept the concepts of social and economic structure transmitted by the teacher -- or decide not to read.15

Only through appropriate materials can students realize the power of the word, their power within social contexts, and how they can, therefore, participate in their setting through response to and transformation of its conditions. Realizing that education often ignores its responsibility to disenfranchised populations, Freire discovered its forceful, threatening multiplicity: its capacity for disabling students by making them feel insignificant and its potentia for valuing human worth and empowering individuals to respond to their environment in a critical, transforming manner -- the latter, of course, reflecting his model of liberatory teaching.

The context of Freire's pedagogy explains his response to literacy, which carries a political current emphasizing student authority. His work is regarded as "something quite new and creative in educational philosophy. . . a situation of direct engagement in the struggle to liberate men and women for the creation of a new world. . . a perspective on education which is authentically his own and which seeks to respond to the concrete realities of Latin America."[16] However, though the context for Freire's philosophy presents unique conditions, the force of his pedagogy has earned attention in other regions, including the United States, where college-level writing and English as a Second Language

instruction reflects Liberatory Learning responding to standards and learning activity within academic institutions.

FREIREAN PEDAGOGY IN FAMILIAR CONTEMPORARY CONTEXTS: WRITING AND ESL PROGRAMS IN AMERICAN UNIVERSITIES

American educators who subscribe to liberatory teaching find a "culture of silence" in their classes. Pointing to oppressed minority students who struggle to assimilate and traditional students who have been alienated by certain features of schooling -- standardized testing, decontextualized learning, tracking, and the practice of teaching to tests -- educators find not only a "culture of silence" but a "culture of sabotage," students who respond defensively to a regime imposed upon them.[17] Discussing the increasing separation between what American students read and the real world, the tremendous gap between their experiences and course materials, Ira Shor, a principal advocate of Liberatory Learning in the United States, explains how American students are as alienated as Freire's oppressed citizens are.[18] Lack of interest and motivation, symptoms teachers cannot ignore, surface, revealing that traditional decontextualized approaches to learning are clearly unacceptable for developing the language and thought -- sense of identity -- associated with professional goals.

Discussing American students in A Pedagogy for Liberation: Dialogues on Transforming Education, Shor and

Freire describe a "normative, dehumanizing approach, [within universities which] separates critical thought from living [and] disempowers students politically and psychologically, destroying enthusiasm,"[19] causing, for example, foreign students in traditional settings to lack identity and authority as they struggle to find a place in their new society. Similarly, within a traditional framework, college writers give up and write for teachers rather than themselves since their curriculum, so removed from their personal experiences, does not generate the critical reflection which can direct them to their own voice. As Freire emphasizes, these students are being domesticated rather than liberated, for "intellectual discipline is not the result of something the teacher does to learners. Although the presence, the orientation, the stimulation, the authority of the teacher are all essential, the discipline has to be built and internalized by students"[20]; institutional standards merely reinforce the teacher's authority while paralyzing students as objects.[21]

To avoid silencing their students, informed composition and ESL teachers modify their instruction by focusing on the principles Freire advocates. Their programs represent a synthesis of Freirean pedagogy, for the features he practices -- dialogue, student engagement, and learning which inspires activity as well as response -- fuse in practice focusing on student-centered activity. Engaged in their studies through dialogue -- collaboration and

conferencing -- underprepared students focus on problems challenging them as students, writers, immigrants, and/or prospective professionals. They articulate and respond to their skills and studies, coming to understand themselves and their educational goals. Individuals experiencing difficulty with study habits or test-taking skills, for example, learn to learn, discovering through collaboration with teachers and peers workable learning strategies. Through others, they understand the meaning and application of their actions, which, in turn, directs a developing awareness of their skills and the promise of improvement.[22] Likewise, deficient college writers find that teachers do not impose strategies and styles on developing writers but focus instead on students' authentic language production, enabling them to discover their voice and their text.[23] When dialogue is practiced in the classroom, in a Freirean sense, with focus on individual student concerns, learners are engaged in the process; they assume control for learning, and this control, in turn, generates the authority permitting them to act -- to transform their immediate academic concerns as well as their long term goals. In programs reflecting Liberatory Learning, language study assumes a broader context. No longer confined to academics nor product-oriented, it possesses social significance, emerging in the classroom through reading, writing, and listening activities grounded in human experience and

conducive to the development of skills, authority, and identity.

This response to the needs of underprepared, nontraditional, and possibly alienated students represents practical application of Freirean principles. Incorporating these ideas in their teaching and engaging students in critical decision-making contexts, educators demonstrate the benefits of Freire's contemporary pedagogy in very different contexts. However, the practice Freire describes does not represent an exclusive, emergent pedagogy lacking historical ties, for the principles he advocates -- dialogue, student engagement, and learning which stimulates response -- find antecedents in the classical models. Freire's contemporary pedagogy marks, in a unique context, the reiteration and application of timeless, traditional principles regarding the educational process.

FREIRE AND THE CLASSICAL MODELS

Lauded for innovative approaches regarding literacy, its unique political perspective context-embedded, Liberatory Learning represents, nonetheless, the re-working of fundamental principles regarding learning for the specific goals Freire entertains. Rather than achieving a completely new pedagogy when teaching illiterate peasants, Freire employs, surprisingly, methods traditionally reserved for literate, responsible learners, such as Greek scholars and graduate-level business students. Dialogue, student

engagement, and reflection/response, the basic features of Liberatory Learning, place responsibility on those individuals often perceived as irresponsible because of their socio-economic status. The responsibility and action Freire hopes to inspire among the illiterate, through literacy and authority, parallel the learning processes characterizing the Socratic Method, Dewey's Experimentalism, and, most surprising of all, the Harvard Business School Case Method.

Freire's principal method, dialogue, characterized educational activities existing well before the emergence of liberatory learning programs -- in Ancient Greece, where Socrates practiced dialogic inquiry, and at Harvard University, where dialogue complements the case method of study utilized by the Business School. Practicing dialogue somewhat differently, these pedagogies share, nevertheless, a fundamental premise -- that learning is a mutual endeavor of both teacher and student, involving discovery and the development of student thought.

Important to dialogue is the outcome a teacher wishes it to reach; in Freire's case, for example, dialogue provides a means to language development and, eventually, social action. Focusing on what dialogue should "do" to a student reveals how the method takes its shape from the philosophy and intent of its users. For example, Plato's Meno, an exemplar of the Socratic Method, depicts a feature unique to dialogue as Socrates practiced it, the

bewilderment which, for him, is a necessary part of learning, preparing both student and teacher for their search:

> Socrates: For I don't cause perplexity in others while free of perplexities myself; the truth is rather that I cause perplexity in others because I myself am perplexed. And so it is now with virtue. I don't know what it is, while you, who may have known before I touched you are now in like way ignorant. Nevertheless, I wish to join you in inquiring what it is.24

The bewilderment Socrates encourages, though secondary to his ultimate goal -- modeling the learning process and achieving illumination -- detracts from student authority and thus conflicts with Freire's views stressing student awareness and affirmation. While Socrates and his student are often left confused about what they do in fact know (80a), Freire labors as a facilitator, encouraging students to reflect critically and formulate solutions -- to act. He accepts their genuine response, finding no view less valid than another. Remarkably, this tendency to encourage and accept student response characterizes, as well, learning activity at the Harvard Business School. How can it be that a pedagogy of oppressors -- Harvard scholars -- shares techniques with a pedagogy of the oppressed?

Within the Business School, professors employ methods resembling Freire's discovery and reflection to utilize the case method effectively. Administrators feel that instructors must "stimulate individual students . . . to

engage in constructive educational dialogue . . . [revealing, then,] a pedagogy which [emphasizes] student discovery rather than instructor revelation."[25] In their studies, business students practice the managerial problem-solving of the real world within a school setting,[26] utilizing discussion to persuade peers and achieving, in the process, expression, assessment, clarification, and affirmation of <u>their views and their managerial styles</u>. Immersed in discussion and critical reflection, both groups, illiterate peasants and business students, engage in humanistic learning even though their social class and, ultimately, their concerns differ.

The manner in which dialogue functions among the pedagogies goes further. As Socrates and Meno pursue a definition of virtue (71d-73c), Socrates asks direct, open-ended questions, pressing Meno to explain the nature of virtue. Stimulating Meno's response, Socrates succeeds nonetheless in prescribing and sustaining the focus of their investigation; with craft, for example, he drives Meno to reflect on and follow <u>his</u> train of thought as the terms virtue and justice are explored (73c-74b). Socrates' inquiry discourages the discovery characterizing Freire's approach, and differing purposes for learning as well as varied student needs may explain the subtle shift in practice. The notion that the Socratic Method denies the shared learning Freire proposes finds support in the physical lay-out of the <u>Meno</u>.

The majority of the dialogue is consumed by Socrates; though advocating shared responsibilities for learning, he absorbs and enjoys the burden, thus suggesting a desire to control the enterprise. Furthermore, Socrates frequently rejects Meno's contributions, often criticizing the nature of his queries. For example, when Meno suggests various types of virtue (72a), Socrates responds with sarcasm: "This is quite a stroke of luck, Meno. I was looking for one virtue, and here I've found a whole swarm of them settled at your side." (72b) Criticizing his student and monopolizing the conversation, Socrates appears to impart knowledge or, perhaps, to model inquiry rather than actually engage his student in learning activity. Controlling discovery rather than sharing a quest, Socrates does not achieve, through dialogue, the purpose Freire envisions -- the revelation of student knowledge through teacher restraint. As Socrates' approach differs from Freire's, the Business School Case Method shares similarities and differences with the two. Similar to Liberatory Learning, business students, engaged in activity with teachers serving as "hosts," search for ways to act as Freire's students do, yet literature on this particular version of the Case Method likewise emphasizes professors' artistic command of classroom discussion, implying some type of control similar to that which Socrates exercises. Overall, though Socrates may value dialogue and advocate student involvement as Harvard professors and Freire do, the context he creates differs from the

environments characterizing Liberatory Learning and the Case Method. With the latter two, subject-matter -- whether the degradation of Third World poverty or the power to make crucial managerial decisions -- is grounded in human experience regarding society, intellect, profession, and/or culture. Participating in these programs, students direct educational activity, learning, in the process, to live and to act.[27]

As a tool for learning, dialogue is an enduring feature of educational theory. Whether philosophizing with Socrates about the nature of virtue, discussing formally appropriate decisions for realistic managerial problems, or searching for ways to alleviate hunger and poverty, students engaged in such learning processes experience, in varying degrees, self-expression, the distancing of "self" from insight and, subsequently, the refinement of their views through the tension achieved in collaboration. Though the qualitative nature of dialogue shifts slightly from context to context, it remains a symbol of authentic response and discovery -- the student engagement integral to its very nature regardless of context.

Relying upon and valuing student input, dialogue demands student participation in and responsibility for learning. Meno must respond to or consider Socrates' questions even though Socrates controls, to some degree, the parameters of their investigation and thus the direction of Meno's thought; Freire's illiterates generate their

subject-matter, discovering, in the process, inner feelings and real-life experiences which warrant critical response; and students in the Harvard Business School, by nature of their course descriptions, assess cases, proposing and supporting solutions and thus developing individual management styles. Clearly, dialogue ensures engagement, the active learning which reveals student thought [human processes] -- decision, reflection, response, and reaction rooted in life experiences and cultural values. Instruction designed with genuine interest in accommodating student discussion involves the active learning -- genuine engagement -- proposed by liberatory teaching, demonstrated (to a degree) in the Meno, and described in both the Business School Case Method and Dewey's Experimentalism.

Evident in Meno's response to Socrates' techniques (80a) and suggested through description of the Case Method, active learning empowers students; sharing insights, experiences, and values, they clarify their own ideas rather than have another's imposed on them. For this to occur, neither teacher nor student can be threatened by the power of the other; they must, Dewey and Freire seem to suggest, be open to discovering each other's views regarding contexts considered. Qualifying student engagement in the learning process, Dewey reminds teachers, though, that students do not assume control in the classroom while teachers distance themselves from activities. He describes unique interaction to which the Business School's Case Method alludes as well:

"the teacher is a learner, and the learner is, without knowing it, a teacher -- and upon the whole, the less consciousness there is, on either side, of either giving or receiving instruction, the better."[28]

Asserting this Utopian view, Dewey expresses certain values associated with dialogue-based learning activity which challenge common beliefs regarding education. Teachers <u>are</u> perceived as authority figures -- those who hold the answers and can direct students to them -- and students often come to class waiting to be "taught." Can Experimentalism and Liberatory Learning, in particular, overcome these values, can teachers really soften their authority as they attempt to promote dialogue, and can students actually assume responsibility for learning? Socrates, for one, does not abandon completely the power associated with his profession. Even though he claims to engage Meno in mutual discovery, he seems guilty of the banking education Freire criticizes. Dialogue alone, then, does not ensure the experienced-based critical reflection and shared learning advocated most strongly in Liberatory Learning and Experimentalism. Certain political views regarding equity, social theories regarding learning contexts, epistemology describing knowledge as "acting and doing," and a psychology describing human potential must complement inquiry if critical learning and personal development through student engagement are to be nurtured.

Thus, dialogue, by its nature, successful in achieving interaction and generating diverse insights testing the concept of right/wrong and coloring content, does not guarantee a quest for knowledge discovered by and transformed according to individual perception. Ultimately, the manner in which dialogue, a feature of learning which has endured through time, functions as a method achieving engagement and response rests with the epistemological views of those utilizing it.

The four pedagogies share similarities and subtle differences in their understanding of "knowing." Questions significant to discussion of pedagogy and epistemology include whether knowledge does, indeed, involve "knowing"; whether it describes "acting and doing"; and/or whether it is something which already exists or something yet to be created.

In searching for definitions and the teachability of certain concepts, Socrates seeks truth. The fact that he rejects several of Meno's insights (his types of virtue for example) as well as those of Gorgias suggests that though he becomes bewildered in his quest for knowledge, he envisions a certain endpoint. Again, the dialogue-generated mutuality Socrates proposes differs from that of other theorists. He and Meno collaborate, yet their quest for definition separates their method of inquiry from others', for Socrates' unilateral rejection of some insights and his emphasis on a single definition depict a search for

universal knowledge even though its actual content may elude him.

In contrast, the knowledge/information sought through the Case Method, Experimentalism, and Liberatory Learning is shaped by learners as they reflect on their respective professional and social contexts. In the Harvard Business School, where learning activities stress application, case problems press students to resolve real-life dilemmas and thus train them to act, to do. Their preparation downplays the acquisition of information, stressing instead the development of individual management styles which reflect unique response to and control of phenomena associated with their profession.[29] Emphasizing discovery and affirmation of management style through decision-making activity rather than the imposition of a single framework on students through the transfer of knowledge, the School's philosophy identifies knowledge as activity rooted in perception and experience. The epistemology supporting this practice shares explicit bonds with Dewey's Experimentalism. Likewise emphasizing the role human experience plays in education, Dewey proposes a unique view of knowledge: "[no standard belief exists because] it is the very nature of experience to instigate all kinds of contrary beliefs . . . Its logical outcome is that anything is good and true to the particular individual which his experience leads him to believe true and good at a particular time and place."[30] Implying an understanding of humans' evanescent natures and

thus their lifelong learning and transformation, Dewey's insights are consistent, as well, with features of Freire's Third World Pedagogy.

As Freire tailors instruction to accommodate the varied experiences of his students, understanding that relevant generative words and coded representations differ among communities, he acknowledges human experience as the basis of learning. Engaging his students in critical reflection of their lives so that they can transform, create, or shape their identities and living conditions, Freire, too, understands that knowledge, activity resting with individual response, involves doing, acting, discovering, and solving. The epistemology governing Freire's contemporary pedagogy is more consistent with the principles described by both the Case Method and Experimentalism than the practice attempted in the Socratic Method. Overall, the four pedagogies cited share methods and premises, yet Liberatory Learning, the Case Method, and Dewey's Model describe, consistently, a fusion of those pedagogical principles which, emerging in Freire's Contemporary Third World Pedagogy, have endured through time; that is, these models of learning succeed, through collaboration, in engaging students and inspiring them to act, to decide, to transform, to become.

CONCLUSION

Study of classical pedagogies is intriguing, for a broad historical overview of educational thought, complemented by consideration of a new pedagogy such as Freire's Liberatory Learning, reveals striking similarities among models of teaching despite differences in context, subject-matter, and student body. Though several individuals shaping educational thought seemed consumed by context when formulating their ideas -- Freire, for example, was moved by oppression in Brazil while professors at Harvard Business School were clearly influenced by Langdell, and Dewey's philosophy reflects the efforts of the Progressive Movement as well as Peirce's Pragmatism -- the models they propose reveal, with subtle differences, concerns critical to educational practice through the course of time. Sharing a broad focus on interaction, the four pedagogies -- the Socratic Method, the Harvard Business School Case Method, Dewey's Experimentalism, and Freire's Pedagogy of the Oppressed -- portray learning as a quest, a process of discovery, and thus reiterate, practice, and alter, for their own intentions and the populations they serve, beliefs regarding the educational process which have endured through time: the importance of dialogue; the need to engage students in learning activity; and one significant educational objective, inspiring students to do, to act, to transform.

ENDNOTES

[1] Paulo Freire and Donald Macedo, Literacy: Reading the Word and the World (South Hadley, MA: Bergen and Garvey Publishers, Inc., 1987), 7.

[2] Kenneth Bruffee, "Collaborative Learning and the 'Conversation of Mankind,'" College English 46 (1984): 647-651.

[3] Paulo Freire, Pedagogy of the Oppressed, with a Foreword by Richard Shaull (New York: Continuum, 1989), 10-12.

[4] Paulo Freire and Ira Shor, A Pedagogy for Liberation: Dialogues on Transforming Education (South Hadley, MA: Bergen and Garvey Publishers, Inc., 1987), 77.

[5] Paulo Freire, Pedagogy in Process: The Letters of Guineau-Bissau, trans. Carman Hunter (New York: Seabury Press, 1978), 42.

[6] Paulo Freire, Cultural Action for Freedom (Cambridge: Harvard Educational Review and Center for the Study of Development and Social Change, 1970) 1, 19-21.

[7] Daniel S. Schipani, Conscientization and Creativity: Paulo Freire and Christian Education (Lanham, MD: University Press of America, Inc. 1984), ix.

[8] Paulo Freire, Pedagogy of the Oppressed, 13.

[9] Freire and Shor, 104.

[10] Paulo Freire, Education and Critical Consciousness (New York: Seabury Press, 1973), 46.

[11] Freire and Shor, 102.

[12] Ibid., 156.

[13] Schipani, 1.

[14] Ira Shor, ed., Freire for the Classroom: A Sourcebook for Liberatory Teaching Portsmouth, NH: Boynton Cook Publishers, 1987), 225-226.

[15] Ibid., 215.

[16] Freire, Pedagogy of the Oppressed, 11.

[17] Freire and Shor, 123.

[18] Ibid., 135.

[19] Ibid., 137.

[20] Freire, "Letter to North-American Teachers," 214.

[21] Ira Shor, Critical Thinking and Everyday Life (Boston: South End Press, 1980), 112.

[22] Paulo Freire, "Letter to North-American Teachers," trans. Carman Hunter, in Freire for the Classroom: A Sourcebook for Liberatory Teaching, ed. Ira Shor (Portsmouth: Boynton Cook Publishers, 1987), 213.

[23] Marilyn M. Cooper, "Unhappy Conscicusness in First-Year English: How to Figure Things out for Yourself," in Writing as Social Action, ed. Marilyn M. Cooper and Michael Holzman (Portsmouth: Boynton/Cook Publishers, 1989), 56-58.

[24] Plato Meno 80d. Henceforth, all references will be indicated within text.

[25] Roland Christensen with Abby J. Hansen, "Teaching with Cases at the Harvard Business School," chap. in Teaching and the Case Method (Boston: Harvard Business School, 1987), 18.

[26] Ibid., 22.

[27] James Sloan Allen, "The Use and Abuse of Humanistic Education," in Teaching and the Case Method (Boston: Harvard Business School, 1987), 51-52.

[28] John Dewey, Democracy and Education (New York: Macmillan, 1914), 160.

[29] Christensen, 24.

[30] Dewey, 265.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Allen, James Sloan. "The Use and Abuse of Humanistic Education," in Teaching and the Case Method. Boston: Harvard Business School, 1987.

Auerbach, Elsa Roberts and Denise Burgess. "The Hidden Curriculum of Survival ESL." TESOL Quarterly, 19:3 (1985): 475-495.

Bruffee, Kenneth. "Collaborative Learning and the 'Conversaton of Mankind.'" College English, 46 (1984): 635-652.

Christensen, Roland and Abbey J. Hansen. "Teaching with Cases at Harvard Business School," in Teaching and the Case **Method**. Boston: Harvard Business School, 1987.

Brown, Cynthia. "Literacy in 30 Hours: Paulo Freire's Process in Northeast Brazil." Chicago: Alternate Schools Network, 1983.

Collins, D. Paulo Freire: His Life, Thought and Work. New York: Paulist Press, 1975.

Cooper, Marilyn M. and Michael Holzman. Writing as Social Action. Portsmouth: Boynton/Cook Publishers, 1989.

Elasser, Nan and Vera P. John-Steiner. "An Interactionist Approach to Advancing Literacy." Harvard Educational Review, 43:3 (1977): 355-369.

Finlay, Linda Shaw and Valerie Faith. "Illiteracy and Alienation in American Colleges: Is Paulo Freire's Pedagogy Relevant?" Radical Teacher, 16 (1979): 28-37.

Fiore, Kyle and Nan Elsasser. "Strangers No More: A Liberatory Literacy Curriculum." College English, 44:2 (1982): 115-128.

Freire, Paulo. Cultural Action for Freedom. Monographs of the Harvard Educational Review and Center for the Study of Development and Social Change. (1), 1970.

_____. Education for Critical Consciousness. New York: Seabury, 1973.

_____. Letter to North American Teachers. Translated by C. Hunter. In Freire for the Classroom: A Sourcebook for Liberatory Teaching, ed. Ira Shor, 211-214. Portsmouth: Boynton/Cook Publishers, 1985.

_____. Pedagogy of the Oppressed. New York: Continuum, 1970; reprint, New York: Continuum, 1989.

_____. Pedagogy in Process: The Letters to Guinea-Bissner, trans. by C. Hunter. New York: Seabury, 1978.

_____. Politics of Education. South Hadley: Bergen and Garvey Publishers, 1985.

Freire, Paulo and Donaldo Macedo. Literacy: Reading the Word and the World. South Hadley: Bergen and Garvey Publishers, 1987.

Holzman, Michael. "A Post-Freirean Model for Adult Literacy Education." College English, 48 (1986): 364-375.

Plato. Meno. In Plato, trans. by Reginald Allen. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1984.

Schipani, Daniel S. Conscientization and Creativity: Paulo Freire and Christian Education. Lanham, Maryland: University Press of America, Inc., 1984.

Shor, Ira. Critcal Thinking and Everyday Life. Boston: South End Press, 1980.

_____. "Equality is Excellence: Transforming Teacher Education and the Learning Process." Harvard Educational Review, 56:4 (1986): 406-426.

_____, ed. Freire for the Classroom: A Sourcebook for Liberatory Teaching. Portsmouth: Boynton/Cook Publishers, 1987.

Shor, Ira and Paulo Freire. A Pedagogy for Liberation: Dialogues on Transforming Education. South Hadley: Bergen and Garvey Publishers, 1987.

Wallerstein, Nina. "Problem-posing Education: Freire's Method for Transformation." In Freire for the Classroom: A Sourcebook for Liberatory Teaching, ed. Ira Shor, 33-44. Portsmouth: Boynton/Cook Publishers, 1987.